

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS:

The office action dated March 20, 2007 objected to the drawings; rejected claims 1-11 under 35 USC 101 for non-statutory subject matter; rejected claims 10-11 under 35 USC 112, 1st paragraph; rejected claim 7 under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph for antecedent basis and inconsistency with claim 6; rejected claims 1-7, 9-17 and 19-20 under 35 USC 102(e) as anticipated by Havekost (US 7,023,440); and rejected claims 8 and 18 under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Havekost in view of Raboczi (US 2003/0061209). These are addressed below in turn following the Interview Summary.

Interview Summary:

A telephone interview was held between Examiner Brier and representative Stanton on July 6, 2007, for which the undersigned representative submitted proposals now of record. Agreement was reached that the amendments made herein overcome the rejections under 35 USC 101 and 112, 2nd para. Agreement was not reached as to claim 3. It was discussed that the rejection of claims 4-5 relied on the events passing the filter in Havekost being distinguished from those not passing the filter by being displayed; Havekost does not display those events that do not pass the filter. Agreement was reached that claims 4 and 5 would distinguish over the references if they were amended to explicitly recite that both the alarm and non-alarm events (as to claim 4) and the events passing the filter and the events not passing the filter (as to claim 5) were displayed. Figure 8A-8B of the application referred to while discussing claims 4-5. Specific language was not discussed for claims 4 and 5

Drawings: Replacement formal drawing sheets are attached hereto.

35 USC 101: The preambles of independent claims 1 and 10 are amended with subject matter from paragraph [00025] to recite memory instead of medium and to recite actions taken by the computer. The computer readable memory (reference number 28 in Fig. 1) is seen to avoid any reading on a disembodied carrier wave signal. The actions taken by the computer is seen to avoid any implication that these claims recite non-functional data structures.

35 USC 112: Claims 10-11 are canceled. Claim 7 is amended to depend from claim 5, the conjunctive “and” is replaced with “or”, and antecedent basis for “distinguishing indicia” is cured by the amendment made to claim 5.


35 USC 102(e): Claim 1 is amended with the subject matter of (now canceled) claim 4, and also amended to recite explicitly that both the alarm and non-alarm events are displayed in the graphical format, as agreed in the interview. Claim 12 is similarly amended.

Claim 5 is rewritten in independent form, and amended to recite that both events passing the filter and events not passing the filter are displayed and distinguished from one another in both the tabular format and the graphical format by a distinguishing indicia, as agreed in the interview. Claims 16 and 20 are similarly amended.

Claims 6 and 17 are canceled in view of the amendments made to claims 5 and 16.

Each independent claim is seen to distinguish over Havekost or any combination of Havekost with any other reference of record. The undersigned representative appreciates the interview, has undertaken to amend then claims as was agreed would distinguish over the references of record, and now requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections and pass claims 1-3, 5-9, 12-14 and 16-20 to issue. The undersigned representative welcomes the opportunity to resolve any matters that may remain, formal or otherwise, via teleconference at the Examiner’s discretion.

Respectfully submitted:



Jerry Stanton
Reg. No.: 46,008

July 10, 2007
Date

Customer No.: 49132
HARRINGTON & SMITH, PC
4 Research Drive
Shelton, CT 06484-6212
Phone: (203) 925-9400
Facsimile: (203) 944-0245
Email: gstanton@hspatent.com